

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

ORIGINAL

PATENT APPLICATION
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10005499-1

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Jeff A. PARKS et al.

Confirmation No.: 5740

Application No.: 09/939,095

Examiner: C. B. Paula

Filing Date: 08/24/2001

Group Art Unit: 2178

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR APPLICATION ENTITLEMENT

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
AUG 19 2005

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner For Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on 06/27/2005.

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is (37 CFR 1.17(c)) \$500.00.

(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

() (a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 (fees: 37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d) for the total number of months checked below:

() one month	\$120.00
() two months	\$450.00
() three months	\$1020.00
() four months	\$1590.00

RECEIVED
OIPE/IAP

AUG 22 2005

() The extension fee has already been filled in this application.

(X) (b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Please charge to Deposit Account **08-2025** the sum of \$500.00. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

() I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. Date of Deposit: _____

OR

(X) I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on 08/19/2005

Number of pages: 27

Typed Name: Christina L. Paz

Signature: *Christina L. Paz*

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff A. PARKS et al.

By: *Jonathan M. Harris*

Jonathan M. Harris

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 44,144

Date: 08/19/2005

Telephone No.: (713) 238-8000

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

003

AUG 19 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appellants:	Jeff A. PARKS et al.	§	Confirmation No.:	5740
		§		
Serial No.:	09/939,095	§	Group Art Unit:	2178
		§		
Filed:	08/24/2001	§	Examiner:	C. B. Paula
		§		
For:	System And Method For	§	Docket No.:	10005499-1
	Application Entitlement	§		

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date: August 19, 2005

Sir:

Appellants hereby submit this Appeal Brief in connection with the above-identified application. A Notice of Appeal was filed via facsimile on June 27, 2005.

08/22/2005 HLE333 00000014 082025 09939095

01 FC:1402 500.00 DA

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	REAL PARTY IN INTEREST	3
II.	RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES	4
III.	STATUS OF THE CLAIMS	5
IV.	STATUS OF THE AMENDMENTS	6
V.	SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER	7
VI.	GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL.....	10
VII.	ARGUMENT	11
A.	§ 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 1-6	11
B.	Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-19, and 21-24.....	11
1.	Claims 1-5.....	12
2.	Claims 7-9.....	12
3.	Claims 10-12.....	13
4.	Claims 13, 15-16.....	13
5.	Claims 17-19.....	14
6.	Claims 21-24.....	14
C.	Claims 25-30.....	15
D.	Claim 6.....	15
E.	Claims 14 and 20.....	16
VIII.	CONCLUSION	17
IX.	CLAIMS APPENDIX	18
X.	EVIDENCE APPENDIX	24
XI.	RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX.....	25

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is the Hewlett-Packard Development Company (HPDC), a Texas Limited Partnership, having its principal place of business in Houston, Texas. HPDC is a wholly owned affiliate of Hewlett-Packard Company (HPC). The Assignment from the inventors to HPC was recorded on January 22, 2002, at Reel/Frame 012538/0251. The Assignment from HPC to HPDC was recorded on September 30, 2003, at Reel/Frame 014061/0492.

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellants are unaware of any related appeals or interferences.

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Originally filed claims: 1-20.
Claim cancellations: None.
Added claims: 21-30.
Presently pending claims: 1-30.
Presently appealed claims: 1-30.

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

IV. STATUS OF THE AMENDMENTS

An amendment to claim 1 was submitted after filing the Notice of Appeal to correct a formality. The amendment was not a substantive amendment, does not require further searching, and merely puts claim 1 in better condition for appeal. Appellants assume this amendment has been or will be entered. However, if the amendment to claim 1 is not entered, then Appellants appeal the § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claim 1 for the reasons stated below. The Claims Appendix includes claim 1 without the amendment noted above.

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

V. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The background section of Appellants' disclosure explains the problem addressed by the claimed inventions. Software developers typically incorporate "business rules" into the software they create. "The problem with this approach is that when the business rules...change, then the user interface...must be changed. These modifications...can be time-consuming and expensive. In software engineering, it is valuable to be able to separate the business rules used with a computer application from the application and user interface." Page 2, para. 0002. While it is beneficial to separate the business rule logic layer from the application or presentation layer, "it can be a challenge to efficiently integrate the application and presentation layer with the database and business rule software." Pages 2-3, para. 0004.

In at least one embodiment, Appellants' contribution is a method that comprises requesting at least a portion of an application screen from a database and associated business rule objects in response to a request for an application screen. The method further comprises identifying a returned application screen, wherein the returned application screen is different from the requested application screen if the requested application screen cannot be provided based on at least one of the business rule objects. The method also comprises providing the returned application screen to a presentation object. Pages 3-4, paras. 0005-0008; Figures 1-4 and associated text on pages 5-11.

Another method embodiment comprises receiving a request for a user screen from a presentation object and receiving a user screen response from a database and business rules object. The user screen response comprises a different user screen than requested when the requested user screen cannot be provided based on said business rules object. The method further comprises identifying the user screen response that has been returned and formatting the user screen response for display through the presentation object based on the identified user screen response. Pages 3-4, paras. 0005-0008; Figures 1-4 and associated text on pages 5-11.

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

In other embodiments, a computer system comprises a presentation object, a response table, and a formatting object. The presentation object requests a user screen and data from a database and business rules object, wherein the database and business rules object comprises rules that determine if the requested user screen can be returned. The response table translates a response user screen from the database and business rules object and provides display properties for the response user screen when a different user screen is returned than was originally requested. The formatting object formats the user screen and combines it with requested data for display. The different user screen is returned if the requested user screen cannot be returned. Pages 3-4, paras. 0005-0008; Figures 1-4 and associated text on pages 5-11.

In still another embodiment, a computer system comprises a request index template, a business rules engine and database, a request handler, a response table, and a template assembler. The request index template receives a screen request from a computer application and retrieves a request template from a request table to format a database query based on the screen request. The business rules engine and database fulfills the database query by returning a display screen and related non-cached data. The request handler, coupled to the request index template, receives the database query, submits the database query to the business rules engine and database, and receives a display screen and related data in response to the database query. The response table associated with the request handler that matches the display screen received to the appropriate screen response template from the response table. The template assembler assembles a formatted display screen based on the screen response template, the display screen received, and the related non-cached data. The business rules engine and database comprises rules that govern whether the requested display screen can be returned. A different display screen is returned when the requested display screen cannot be returned. Pages 3-4, paras. 0005-0008; Figures 1-4 and associated text on pages 5-11.

Another method embodiment comprises receiving a screen request from a computer application. retrieving a request template corresponding to the screen

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

request using a request index template, preparing a database query based on the request template, submitting the database query to a business rules object and database, and returning a screen and associated non-cached data from the business rules object and database in response to the database query. The returned screen is different from the screen requested if the screen requested cannot be provided based on rules stored in the business rules object and database. The method further comprises identifying a response template for the screen returned and assembling a formatted display screen by combining the response template and the returned screen. Pages 3-4, paras. 0005-0008; Figures 1-4 and associated text on pages 5-11.

Yet another method comprises requesting an application screen, examining a business rule to determine whether the requested application screen can be provided, receiving the requested application screen if the business rule permits the requested application screen to be provided, and receiving an alternate application screen if the business rule does not permit the requested application screen to be provided. Pages 3-4, paras. 0005-0008; Figures 1-4 and associated text on pages 5-11.

Appellants' disclosure also describes a computer system that comprises a database comprising an application screen and a substitute application screen, a business rules object comprising a business rule, and a request engine adapted to send a request for the application screen to the business rules object. The business rules object responds to the request for the application screen by providing the requested application screen if the business rule permits access to the application screen. The business rules object responds to the request for the application screen by providing the substitute application screen if the business rule does not permit access to the application screen. Pages 3-4, paras. 0005-0008; Figures 1-4 and associated text on pages 5-11.

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Whether claims 1-6 are indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Whether claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-19, and 21-24 are anticipated (35 U.S.C. § 102(e)) by Wang (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0035579).

Whether claims 25-30 are obvious (35 U.S.C. § 103) over Wang in view of Kupersmit (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0016731).

Whether claim 6 is obvious (35 U.S.C. § 103) over Wang in view of Mighdoll (U.S. Pat. No. 6,662,218).

Whether claims 14 and 20 are obvious (35 U.S.C. § 103) by Wang in view of Tomsen (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0013950).

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

VII. ARGUMENT

A. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 1-6

In the final Office action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 as allegedly failing to satisfy 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner believes there to be an antecedence problem with the phrase "the presentation object." To expedite resolution of this issue, Appellants filed an amendment to claim 1 to change "the" presentation object to "a" presentation object.

While this amendment should be entered, if by chance it is not entered, Appellants challenge the rejection in this Appeal Brief. Appellants believe that one of ordinary skill in the art would find claim 1 to be clear and thus satisfy the clarify requirements of § 112, second paragraph.

B. Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-19, and 21-24

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-19, and 21-24 as anticipated by Wang. Wang discloses an apparatus that transforms web pages for display on web-enabled Internet appliances. See Abstract. Wang purports to solve the problem of providing a web page to any of multiple web-enabled devices having different display physical limitations. Examples of such web-enabled devices include personal computers, which have a full display, and a personal data assistant (PDA) or cell phone which typically have much smaller displays. A web page intended to be displayed on a full size computer display may not be suitable for a much smaller PDA. Paras. 0003-0007.

Wang discloses the use of a transform proxy server 106 (Figure 1) that "receives requests from a web-enabled device, retrieves the requested source material from the appropriate web server, and then transforms the source material into the appropriate format for the receiving device, by applying the appropriate transformation rules." Thus, whether a user uses a personal computer with a full size display or a hand-held device with a small display to request a particular web page, the requested web page is delivered to the user in a suitable format for the user's device.

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

As provided below, Appellants argue the rejections of various of the claims in this claim grouping.

1. Claims 1-5

Appellants select claim 1 as representative of this claim grouping. Claim 1 requires "identifying a returned application screen, wherein the returned application screen is different from the requested application screen if the requested application screen cannot be provided based on at least one of said business rule objects." Wang does not disclose this limitation. In Wang, the user is provided with exactly the web page that is requested. The requested web page has been adjusted to meet the display limitations on the user's device. Wang does not teach or even suggest returning a web page other than what was requested. Further, Wang does not teach or even refer to a returned application screen that is different than what was requested based on a business rule object. At most, Wang discloses formatting web pages based on the physical constraints of a client web-enabled device's display, not based on business rule objects. The Examiner did not use any other art to reject claim 1 and Appellants do not believe any other art of record cures the defects of Wang. Wang thus does not anticipate nor render obvious claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections of the claims in this grouping be reversed, and the grouping set for issue.

2. Claims 7-9

Appellants select claim 7 as representative of this claim grouping. Claim 7 requires receiving a request for a user screen and "receiving a user screen response from a database and business rules object, wherein the user screen response comprises a different user screen than requested when the requested user screen cannot be provided based on said business rules object." Wang does not disclose this limitation. In Wang, the user is provided with exactly the web page that is requested as explained above. While the requested web page has been adjusted per the physical constraints of the user's device, the returned web page is indeed what was requested. Further, Wang does not teach or even refer to a returned application screen that is different than what was requested based

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

on a business rule object. The Examiner did not use any other art to reject claim 7 and Appellants do not believe any other art cures the defects of Wang. Wang thus does not anticipate nor render obvious claim 7.

Based on the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections of the claims in this grouping be reversed, and the grouping set for issue.

3. Claims 10-12

Appellants select claim 10 as representative of this claim grouping. Claim 10 is directed to a computer system that comprises "a presentation object that requests a user screen and data from a database and business rules object, wherein the database and business rules object comprises rules that determine if the requested user screen can be returned." Wang does not disclose this limitation. Wang does not disclose rules in a database business rules object that determines if a requested screen can be returned. In Wang, only requested screens are returned, albeit screens formatted per the physical constraints of the user's device. The Examiner did not use any other art to reject claim 10 and Appellants do not believe any other art cures the defects of Wang. Wang thus does not anticipate nor render obvious claim 10.

Based on the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections of the claims in this grouping be reversed, and the grouping set for issue.

4. Claims 13, 15-16

Appellants select claim 13 as representative of this claim grouping. Claim 13 is directed to a computer system and specifies that "the business rules engine and database comprises rules...govern whether the requested display screen can be returned" and that "a different display screen is returned when the requested display screen cannot be returned." Wang does not disclose or even suggest this combination of limitations as explained above. The Examiner did not use any other art to reject claim 13 and Appellants do not believe any other art cures the defects of Wang. Wang thus does not anticipate nor render obvious claim 13.

Based on the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections of the claims in this grouping be reversed, and the grouping set for issue.

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

5. Claims 17-19

Appellants select claim 17 as representative of this claim grouping. Claim 17 requires receiving a screen request and "returning a screen and associated non-cached data from the business rules object and database...wherein the screen returned is different from the screen requested if the screen requested cannot be provided based on rules stored in the business rules object and database." Wang does not disclose this feature. In Wang, the user is provided with exactly the web page that is requested, albeit modified per the physical constraints of the user's device as explained above. The Examiner did not use any other art to reject claim 17 and Appellants do not believe any other art cures the defects of Wang. Wang thus does not anticipate nor render obvious claim 17.

Based on the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections of the claims in this grouping be reversed, and the grouping set for issue.

6. Claims 21-24

Appellants select claim 21 as representative of this claim grouping. Claim 21 requires "examining a business rule to determine whether the requested application screen can be provided." Wang does not disclose examining a business rule to make such a determination. Claim 21 also requires "receiving the requested application screen if the business rule permits the requested application screen to be provided; and receiving an alternate application screen if the business rule does not permit the requested application screen to be provided." Again, Wang has no such teaching. In Wang, the user is always provided with exactly the web page that was requested, albeit formatted per the physical constraints of the user's device as explained above. The Examiner did not use any other art to reject claim 21 and Appellants do not believe any other art cures the defects of Wang. Wang thus does not anticipate nor render obvious claim 21.

Based on the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections of the claims in this grouping be reversed, and the grouping set for issue.

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

C. Claims 25-30

Appellants select claim 25 as representative of this claim grouping. Claim 25 is directed to a computer system that includes a "a request engine adapted to send a request for the application screen to the business rules object." The system also includes a database that comprises the requested "application screen" and also a "substitute application screen." The requested application screen is provided if a "business rule" so permits; otherwise, the substitute application screen is provided. Thus, a particular screen is requested and that screen is requested if a business rule permits and, if not, a substitute screen is provided.

In Wang, the user does not request any particular version of a screen. The user requests a web page (e.g., www.yahoo.com) and the user is provided with the requested web page, formatted as needed per the device that the user is using. The user does not request one particular application screen with the system responding by providing a different screen. Kupersmit does not cure the defect of Wang in this regard. For at least this reason, the Examiner's rejection of claim 25 is erroneous.

The Examiner seems to have analogized Wang's reference to a "password" to the "business rule" in claim 25. The Examiner referred to para. 0053 in Wang for the reference to a password. Wang explains in para. 0053 that the "security server 204 might provide screening of passwords for user entering the network." One of ordinary skill in the art certainly would recognize that a password at least in this context is not the same or similar as the claimed "business rule." Kupersmit does not cure the defect of Wang in this regard. For this additional reason, the Examiner's rejection of claim 25 is erroneous.

Based on the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections of the claims in this second grouping be reversed, and the grouping set for issue.

D. Claim 6

Claim 6 depends on claim 1. For at least the reasons provided above with regard to claim 1, the Examiner erroneously rejected claim 6.

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

E. Claims 14 and 20

Claims 14 and 20 depend on claims 13 and 17, respectively. For at least the reasons provided above with regard to claims 13 and 17, the Examiner erroneously rejected claims 14 and 20.

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

VIII. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner erred in rejecting all pending claims. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan M. Harris
PTO Reg. No. 44,144
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

IX. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. (Previously presented) A method, comprising:
requesting at least a portion of an application screen from a database and associated business rule objects in response to a request for an application screen;
identifying a returned application screen, wherein the returned application screen is different from the requested application screen if the requested application screen cannot be provided based on at least one of said business rule objects; and
providing the returned application screen to the presentation object.
2. (Previously presented) A method as in claim 1, further comprising identifying the application screen using a response table that comprises a display library.
3. (Previously presented) A method as in claim 2, wherein identifying the returned application screen further comprises formatting the returned application screen using the display library.
4. (Previously presented) A method as in claim 1, wherein identifying the returned application screen comprises formatting the returned application screen.
5. (Previously presented) A method as in claim 1, wherein identifying the returned application screen comprises using an interpreter to identify the returned application screen.
6. (Previously presented) A method as in claim 1, further comprising linking the presentation object and the database and associated business rule objects via a request and response table.

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

7. (Previously presented) A method, comprising:
receiving a request for a user screen from a presentation object;
receiving a user screen response from a database and business rules object, wherein the user screen response comprises a different user screen than requested when the requested user screen cannot be provided based on said business rules object;
identifying the user screen response that has been returned; and
formatting the user screen response for display through the presentation object based on the identified user screen response.
8. (Previously presented) A method as in claim 7, wherein identifying the user screen response comprises using a response table that contains display formatting components.
9. (Previously presented) A method as in claim 8, wherein formatting the user screen response comprises using the display formatting components returned from the response table.
10. (Previously presented) A computer system, comprising:
a presentation object that requests a user screen and data from a database and business rules object, wherein the database and business rules object comprises rules that determine if the requested user screen can be returned; and
a response table to translate a response user screen from the database and business rules object and to provide display properties for the response user screen when a different user screen is returned than was originally requested;
a formatting object to format the user screen and combine it with requested data for display;
wherein the different user screen is returned if the requested user screen cannot be returned.

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

11. (Original) A system as in claim 10 wherein the presentation object is a networked content server.
12. (Original) A system as in claim 10 wherein the formatting object formats the user screens using a markup language.
13. (Previously presented) A computer system, comprising:
a request index template to receive a screen request from a computer application and retrieve a request template from a request table to format a database query based on the screen request;
a business rules engine and database to fulfill the database query by returning a display screen and related non-cached data;
a request handler, coupled to the request index template, to receive the database query, to submit the database query to the business rules engine and database, and to receive a display screen and related data in response to the database query;
a response table associated with the request handler, wherein the request handler matches the display screen received to the appropriate screen response template from the response table; and
a template assembler to assemble a formatted display screen based on the screen response template, the display screen received, and the related non-cached data ;
wherein the business rules engine and database comprises rules that govern whether the requested display screen can be returned; and
wherein a different display screen is returned when the requested display screen cannot be returned.
14. (Original) A system in accordance with claim 13 wherein the template assembler further comprises a caching template assembler to make a second request to the business rules engine and database for data which will be stored in a template caching unit.

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

15. (Original) A system in accordance with claim 13 wherein the screen request is for a web page.
16. (Original) A system in accordance with claim 13 wherein the request index template, the request and response tables, and the request handler are located within a presentation content server.
17. (Previously presented) A method, comprising:
 receiving a screen request from a computer application;
 retrieving a request template corresponding to the screen request using a request index template;
 preparing a database query based on the request template;
 submitting the database query to a business rules object and database;
 returning a screen and associated non-cached data from the business rules object and database in response to the database query, wherein the screen returned is different from the screen requested if the screen requested cannot be provided based on rules stored in the business rules object and database;
 identifying a response template for the screen returned; and
 assembling a formatted display screen by combining the response template, and the screen returned.
18. (Previously presented) A method as in claim 17, further comprising displaying the screen by combining the non-cached data from the database and formatting components loaded with the response template.
19. (Previously presented) A method as in claim 17, further comprising storing the computer application on a content and presentation server.
20. (Previously presented) A method as in claim 17, further comprising making a second request to the business rules object and database to obtain data for the screen and caching the data from the second request.

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

21. (Previously presented) A method, comprising:
requesting an application screen;
examining a business rule to determine whether the requested application screen can be provided;
receiving the requested application screen if the business rule permits the requested application screen to be provided; and
receiving an alternate application screen if the business rule does not permit the requested application screen to be provided.
22. (Previously presented) The method of claim 21, further comprising:
loading a rendering library template; and
combining the received application screen and the rendering library template to create an end-user application screen.
23. (Previously presented) The method of claim 21, further comprising receiving data associated with the requested application screen.
24. (Previously presented) The method of claim 23, further comprising:
loading a rendering library template; and
creating an end-user application screen based on the received application screen, the data, and the rendering library template.
25. (Previously presented) A computer system, comprising:
a database comprising an application screen and a substitute application screen;
a business rules object comprising a business rule; and
a request engine adapted to send a request for the application screen to the business rules object;
wherein the business rules object responds to the request for the application screen by providing the requested application screen if the business rule permits access to the application screen; and

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

wherein the business rules object responds to the request for the application screen by providing the substitute application screen if the business rule does not permit access to the application screen.

26. (Previously presented) The computer system of claim 25, wherein the request engine uses a request template to format a database query, and wherein the request for the application screen comprises the database query.

27. (Previously presented) The computer system of claim 25, further comprising a presentation that uses a response template to format an end-user application screen and that displays the end-user application screen.

28. (Previously presented) The computer system of claim 27, wherein the end-user application comprises the application screen.

29. (Previously presented) The computer system of claim 27, wherein the end-user application comprises the substitute application screen.

30. (Previously presented) The computer system of claim 27,
wherein the database further comprises application data; and
wherein the end-user application screen comprises the application data.

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

X. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

Appl. No. 09/939,095
Appeal Brief dated August 19, 2005
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

XI. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.